

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

**AHMED KAMAL, on behalf of
himself and the putative class,**

Plaintiff,

-vs-

J. CREW GROUP, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

**ANITA PARKER, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly
situated,**

Plaintiff,

-vs-

**J. CREW GROUP, INC.,
J. CREW, LLC, AND DOES 1-100,**

Defendants.

**Hon. William J. Martini
Civil Action No. 15-190 (WJM)**

**Hon. William J. Martini
Civil Action No. 17-1214 (WJM)**

CONSOLIDATION ORDER

THESE MATTERS come before the Court by way of Defendants' motion to consolidate the two cases under the proposed lead docket of Civ. A. No. 15-190 (WJM) [Civ. A. No. 15-190; ECF No. 75];

and the Court having reviewed the motion to consolidate;

and it appearing that "if actions before the court involve a common question of law

or fact, the court may . . . consolidate the actions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a);

and it appearing that Rule 42 “confers upon a district court broad power, whether at the request of a party or upon its own initiative, to consolidate cases for trial as may facilitate the administration of justice,” *Ellerman Lines, Ltd. v. A. & Gulf Stevedors, Inc.*, 339 F.2d 673, 675 (3d Cir. 1964);

and the purpose of consolidation being to “streamline and economize pretrial proceedings so as to avoid duplication of effort, and to prevent conflicting outcomes in cases involving similar legal and factual issues,” *see, e.g., In re TMI Litig.*, 193 F.3d 613, 724 (3d Cir. 1999);

and, here, it appearing that both cases involve common questions of law and fact and common parties, including (i) seemingly identical alleged violations of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transaction Act (“FACTA”) and (ii) request statutory damages and attorney’s fees based on Defendants’ alleged willful misconduct;

and it further appearing that neither Plaintiff has filed opposition to the motion to consolidate, *see e.g.*, Plaintiff Parker’s Response to Consolidate at 2 (ECF No. 76) (“To [c]onsolidate, Ms. Parker does not oppose consolidation of the *Parker* and *Kamal* cases.”);

and it further appearing that consolidation will avoid unnecessary costs and delay in case management, motion practice, and discovery;

and with the knowledge of the parties and with no opposition to consolidation having been filed;

IT IS on this 1st day of May 2017,

ORDERED that, Defendants' motion to consolidate *Kamal v. J. Crew Corp.*, 15-190 (WJM) and *Parker v. J. Crew Corp.*, 17-1214 (WJM) [15-190; ECF No. 75] is **GRANTED**. The cases are hereby consolidated under the lead docket 15-190 (WJM).

s/Mark Falk

MARK FALK
United States Magistrate Judge